

Research & Professional Development
Final Report to the Faculty Senate AY 2020-2021
May 14, 2021

The **Committee on Research and Professional Development** has responsibility for the development and administration of policies for awarding internal grant monies and sabbaticals for faculty research and development. Members: One member elected by and from the Faculty of the Library, two members elected by and from the Faculty of each of the other Schools, the Provost or a designee (ex-officio), and a bargaining unit representative appointed by the President of the Union (ex-officio).

Members

Faculty Members

Christy Goodnight	Chair (2020–2022)
Justin Ostrofsky	Vice Chair (2020–2021)
Chris DiSanto	ARHU (2019–2021)
Kristen Jacobson	ARHU (2020–2022)
Carla Cabarle	BUSN (2019–2021)
Joy Jones	BUSN (2020–2022)
Darrell Cleveland	EDUC (2019–2021)
Douglas Harvey	EDUC (2020–2022)
Raz Segal	GENS (2019–2021)
Emari DiGiorgio	GENS (2020–2022)
Kerri Sowers	HLTH (2019–2021) and Union representative
Bryce Muth	HLTH (2020–2022)
Heather Perez	Library (2020–2022)
Steve Kalman	NAMS (2019–2021)
Craig Lind	NAMS (2020–2022)
Justin Ostrofsky	SOBL (2019–2021)
Keith Williams	SOBL (2020–2022)

Ex Officio Member

Pantelia (Lia) Bairaktaris Programs (Provost designee)	Acting Director for the Office of Research and Sponsored
Ronnie Carlini Maiorino Sponsored Programs	Internal Awards Program Manager of the Office of Research and

Funded awards for FY21

Name	School	Award Type	Title of Award	Funded Amount	Comments
Feige, Jacob	ARHU	Sabbatical	Iconostasis: Investigating Byzantine Painting through Contemporary Materials and Imagery	Spring 21	
Holton, Adalaine	ARHU	Sabbatical	The Liberatory Power of Historical Recovery in Bontemps's <u>'Black Thunder'</u>	Spring 21	
Lubenow, William	ARHU	Sabbatical	Liberalism, Secularism, and the Foundations of the Civil Service in Britain since 1815	Fall 20/Spring 21	
Zuconi, Laura	ARHU	Sabbatical	Book Manuscript: Early Christian and Rabbinic Medicine	Fall 20/Spring 21	
Diener, Keith	BUSN	Sabbatical	Book Project: The Lawyer's Guide to Business Ethics	Fall 20	
McShea, Betsy	GENS	Sabbatical	Three articles focusing on K-12 Math Education	Spring 21	
Ferri, Christine	SOBL	Sabbatical	TimeSlips Intervention with Family Members	Spring 21	Deferred to Fall 21
Lyke, Jennifer	SOBL	Sabbatical	Altered States of Consciousness and Anomalous Experiences	Spring 21	Deferred to Spring 22

In response to the [Anti-Racist Change Resolution](#) passed by the Faculty Senate in June 2020, R&PD took action to see that the evaluative measures we use going forward allow for more BIPOC applicants are awarded grants than in the past. To ensure that our evaluative measures are anti-racist and fair for all applicants regardless of race, gender, or rank for internal grant awards that come before the R&PD, first we did a historical look at past data, discussed how we could make screening applicants more equitable and anti-racist, and implemented an applicant advocates test round during our Main Round screening this year.

The Spring semester we partnered with CTLD during their Week of Teaching to provide informational sessions. We also partnered with FAWN to provide writing assistance to those applying for the Main Round of grant applications during seven of FAWN's Show Up & Write sessions and one of the Writing Boot Camps.

Meeting minutes from all full committee meetings are [viewable here](#).

Summary of the Race-, Sex- & Academic School-Based Disparities in Research & Professional Development (R&PD) Applications & Awards: Report of the Historical Data Working Group Subcommittee of R&PD

Historical Data Working Group: Justin Ostrofsky, Heather Perez, Steven Kalman, Keith Williams, Christopher DiSanto, and Bryce Muth

For this report, we investigated whether there was any race-, sex- and/or academic school-based disparities with respect to the number of applications submitted and the rate of applications being recommended versus denied for award by the R&PD committee.

This report provides two sets of analyses pertaining to applications submitted to and evaluated by the R&PD committee between the Fiscal Years 2016-2020. **In the first set of analyses**, we assessed data pertaining to every one of the 618 submitted applications. However, a limitation to these analyses were that these 618 applications were only prepared by 239 unique faculty members represented in this dataset. Of these 239 faculty members, 154 (or, 64.44%) of them submitted anywhere from 2-10 applications. Thus, one ambiguity of the results reported in the first set of analyses were whether any of the disparities we observed were biased by this large number of faculty members who submitted multiple applications between FY16-20.

In an attempt to resolve this ambiguity, we conducted **a second set of analyses** where faculty members who submitted multiple applications were only included once or twice in the dataset. Individual faculty members were included once if either: (a) they only submitted one application, (b) they submitted multiple applications that were all recommended by the R&PD committee for award, or (c) they submitted multiple applications that were all denied by the R&PD committee for award. Individual faculty members were included twice if they submitted multiple applications and had at least one recommended application and at least one denied application. In this case, they were represented once as a recommended applicant and once as a denied applicant. This resulted in an analysis of 321 submitted applications.

Results Relevant to the First Set of Analyses

With respect to the race-based analyses, we first observed that, relative to the University-wide population of faculty members, Caucasians submitted a disproportionately lower number of applications whereas Asians submitted a disproportionately higher number of applications. Additionally, relative to the pool of applications submitted, we observed that Caucasians had a significantly lower rate of being denied awards than Asians, African Americans and Hispanics. Thus, **we observed a race-based bias for Caucasian applicants to be more likely to be recommended for award than Asian, African American and Hispanic applicants.**

With respect to our sex-based analyses, we first observed that, relative to the University-wide population of faculty members, females submitted a disproportionately higher number of applications and males submitted a disproportionately lower number of applications. However, we did not observe a significant difference in the rate of applications being recommended versus denied for award between male and female applicants. Thus, **we did not observe any sex-based bias with respect to the rate of being recommended versus denied for award.**

With respect to our academic school-based analyses, we first observed that, relative to the University-wide population of faculty members, faculty members in SOBL and ARHU submitted a disproportionately higher number of applications whereas faculty members in BUSN and HLSC submitted a disproportionately lower number of applications. Additionally, we observed that faculty members in SOBL, NAMS and GEN had a significantly lower rate of being denied awards than faculty members in ARHU, BUSN, HLSC and EDUC. Thus, **we observed an academic school-based bias for faculty members in SOBL, NAMS and GEN to be more likely to be granted awards than faculty members in ARHU, BUSN, HLSC and EDUC.**

Results Relevant to the Second Set of Analyses

The results of the second set of analyses indicated that some of the biases described above were either absent or found to be weaker when the alternative sampling methodology was used to assess race-, sex- and academic school-based disparities.

With respect to our race-based analyses, we did not observe any race group to be over- or under-represented in the pool of applicants relative to the racial composition of the University population of faculty members. Further, **although there was a trend for Caucasians to be recommended for award at a higher rate than the other racial groups, there was a marginally non-significant difference between the race groups with respect to the rate of being recommended for award by the R&PD committee.**

With respect to our sex-based analyses, we observed the same pattern of results as was observed in the first set of analyses. Namely, females were over-represented and males were under-represented in the pool of applicants relative to the sex-based composition of the University population of faculty members. However, **we did not observe any sex-based bias with respect to the rate of being recommended versus denied for award.**

With respect to our academic school-based analyses, we did not observe any school to be over- or under-represented in the pool of applicants relative to the academic school-based composition of the University population of faculty members. Further, **although there was a trend for faculty members in NAMS to be recommended for award at a higher rate than faculty members in other schools, we did not observe a statistically significant difference between the academic schools with respect to the rate of being recommended for award.**

In sum, both sets of analyses are consistent in demonstrating that there are no sex-based biases in the rate of recommendation for award by the R&PD committee. In contrast, the judgment of whether there are any race- and/or academic school-based biases in the rate of being recommended for award depends on which set of analyses one believes to be the best method of assessment of bias in the rate of being recommended versus denied for award.

The full report is [viewable here](#).

**Summary of the Proposal for Research & Professional Development (R&PD) Applicant Advocates:
Report of the Applicant Advocates Working Group Subcommittee of R&PD**

Historical Data Working Group: Kerri Sowers, Emari DiGiorgio, Raz Segal, Kirstin Jacobson, and Carla Cabarle

R&PD applicant advocates participate in the R&PD grant application review process from application submission to the end of the grant award process. Their role is to advocate for a fair and inclusive grant award process and to assist R&PD members in efforts to avoid unconscious, unintentional biases toward particular disciplines or individual applicants/projects. The full report outlines the responsibilities of R&PD applicant advocates along with the applicant advocates process. The applicant advocates process includes their selection process, a norming process, evaluation of qualitative and quantitative grant evaluative data for bias, and veto process for identifiable bias which triggers new review with different R&PD members or alternates.

The full report is [viewable here](#). **We would like to officially pilot the Applicant Advocates process in AY 2021-2022. This would involve needing Faculty Senate approval of electing R&PD committee alternates (similar to the FRC alternates) in September by each school.**